DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 731 CS 008 423

AUTHOR Lewis, Jack L.
TITLE Growth in Academic Performance Project, 1984-85 Evaluation Report, ECIA Chapter 1.
INSTITUTION Cincinnati Public Schools, Ohio.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Elementary Schools; Inservice Teacher Education; Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Improvement; *Reading Programs; Remedial Instruction; Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading; Self Concept
IDENTIFIERS Cincinnati Public Schools OH; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

The Growth in Academic Performance Project, the major component of the Cincinnati Public Schools' ECIA (Education Consolidation and Improvement Act) Chapter 1 Program, operated supplementary reading classes in 51 public and 26 nonpublic schools involving 4,891 elementary school students during 1984-85. The four objectives established for that school year were that (1) project pupils have attitudes toward themselves as positive as those of non-project pupils; (2) project pupils have attitudes toward school as positive as those of non-project pupils; (3) opportunities for parent involvement be provided; and (4) inservice training be provided for all project personnel throughout the school year. Chapter 1 teachers and assistants provided 45-50 minutes each day of supplementary reading instruction to groups of five to eight students, worked closely with classroom teachers, and made telephone, personal, and written contact with parents. The national reading achievement objective (a gain, on the average, of seven normal curve equivalents (NCE) between pretest and posttest) was met in grades one through six. The local goals of parent involvement and inservice training were achieved; however the goals regarding student attitude toward self and school were not met. It was recommended that additional efforts be made toward improving student attitudes and increasing parent involvement. (LLZ)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Evaluation Branch

ED269731

# GROWTH IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE PROJECT

## 1984-85 Evaluation Report

## ECIA Chapter 1

By Jack L. Lewis

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jack L. Lewis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

November 1985

Cincinnati Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent



CS 008 423

## Executive Summary

The Growth in Academic Performance project is the major reading component of the Cincinnati Public Schools' ECIA Chapter I program. The project operated supplementary reading classes in 51 public and 26 non-public schools during the 1984-85 school year. In an average week the program enrolled 4,245 children in the public schools and 646 children in the non-public schools.

Children in project classes received 45 to 50 minutes additional reading instruction each day. Chapter I teachers were able to provide great individual attention because only six to eight children at a time were scheduled for Chapter I reading instruction. Objectives for the project were established for reading gain, student attitudes and inservice sessions.

- The reading objective of a seven NCE gain was achieved at grades one through six. Overall, the average achievement gain for all project students exceeded the objective.
- Non-project children had higher self-concept scores than Chapter I children in the same classes and the self-concept objective was not met.
- Chapter I children had less positive attitudes toward school than their non-project classmates and the objective for attitudes toward school was not met.
- Increases were observed over the previous year on most indicators of parent involvement in the Chapter I program.
- Project teachers gave positive ratings to both local school and project inservice sessions.

GROWTH IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE PROJECT

## Introduction

The Growth in Academic Performance project is the major reading component of the Cincinnati Public Schools' ECIA Chapter I program. The component was funded for many years as part of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed in 1965. The original legislation was retitled as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (1981) superseded the original Title I funding as of July 1, 1982. The new legislation continued, with minor changes the objectives of the original ESEA legislation at a reduced funding level.

The Growth in Academic Performance component was designed to meet the needs of children identified as having reading problems, or in the case of first graders, likely to have difficulty learning to read. Researchers identified many possible explanations for early reading difficulties. More important to educators and parents was the clear evidence that children with serious reading problems will, in most cases, fall further behind in reading unless they receive individual attention beyond that which can be offered in the regular classroom.

Before 1974, the Growth in Academic Performance classes were limited to the primary grades. It was felt that this emphasis on the first three grades would lead to fewer reading problems in the higher grades. Expansion of Title I funding after 1974 allowed the creation of Title I classes for children in the intermediate grades in most of the target schools.

From 1975 through 1978, the Title I program employed some 137 teachers who provided supplementary reading instruction in 40 to 50 public and non-public schools. With funding increases in the late seventies, the number of teachers

increased to over 200 and the number of schools offering Title I services increased to over 50.

In 1980, the method of determining a school's eligibility for classes was shifted from the number of families receiving Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) to the number of families eligible for free or reduced price lunches. During the 1980-81 school year, 225 Title I teachers were employed in 64 schools.

Under the ECIA legislation, the Chapter I teaching staff was reduced to 192.5 in 1981-82, to 104 during the 1982-83 school year, and increased to 125.5 in 1983-84. During the 1984-85 school year, the number of Chapter I teachers was increased to 135.0 and the number of schools was increased to 77.

Over the years, the Chapter I classes have been offered at various combinations of grades based on the available staff. In 1984-85, all primary grade children were served in most Chapter I schools. In a few schools, the number of eligible first and second grade children increased and classes were restricted to these grades. In other schools, the number of eligible students in the primary grades decreased and the program was able to serve children in the fifth and sixth grades.

## Project Description

### Objectives

The goal of the Growth in Academic Performance project is to enable children attending schools in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods to learn to read at a level expected of children in average neighborhoods in the country. The reading achievement objective required in ECIA Chapter I reading programs was established at the national level in 1976.

> Project children who are in Growth in Academic Performance classes for a full year will gain, on the average, seven (7) normal curve equivalents in reading achievement in the six (6) months between administrations of a nationally recognized reading test.

The objective specifies that children in the Chapter I classes will learn

to read at a rate significantly higher than children with similar reading levels in all of the schools in the country.

The local Chapter I project is allowed to specify its own objectives which are related to the improvement of reading achievement. Accordingly, the following objectives were retained for the 1984-85 school year:

1. Project pupils will have as positive attitudes toward themselves as non-project pupils.

2. Project pupils will have as positive attitudes toward school as non-project pupils.

3. Opportunities for parent involvement will be provided through these means: (1) District Advisory Council and local school councils, (2) home and school visits, (3) inservice training (4) volunteer service for school activities, and (5) workshops.

4. Inservice training will be provided for all project personnel continuously throughout the school year. Parents are invited and encouraged to participate in these inservice meetings.

Services

The Growth in Academic Performance component of the ECIA Chapter I program funded reading teachers and instructor assistants in 51 public schools and 26 non-public schools (see Table 1). In an average month, the program provided supplementary reading instruction to 4,245 children in the public schools and 646 children in the non-public schools.

Only those schools which exceeded the system-wide average in the proportion of children receiving free or reduced price lunches, or schools with at least 25 percent of its children eligible were selected for the project. Non-public schools located in the attendance area served by an eligible public school were also eligible for the project. Once a school was selected to participate in the program, children attending the school were eligible for the Chapter I classes if they scored in the lower third on a nationally normed reading test. Economic factors were not used to select individual children for project classes.

In order to select from among eligible children, two general guidelines

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Table 1. Staff Levels and Average Membership of Public and Non-Public Schools, 1984-85.

| Schools | Average Membership | Grades Served | Number Teachers | Number Aides |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anderson Place | 72 | 1-4 | 2 | 2 |
| Bond Hill | 37 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Bramble | 75 | 1-4 | 2 | 2 |
| Burton | 85 | 1-3 | 2 | 2 |
| Carson | 33 | 1-2 | 1 | 1 |
| Carthage | 60 | 1-6 | 2 | 2 |
| Central Fairmount | 111 | 1-4 | 3 | 3 |
| Chase Intermediate | 151 | 4-6 | 4 | 4 |
| Cheviot | 36 | 1-3 | 1 | 1 |
| Clifton | 109 | 1-6 | 3 | 3 |
| College Hill | 37 | 1-4 | 1 | 1 |
| Douglass | 39 | 1-3 | 1 | 1 |
| Eastern Hills | 41 | 1-4 | 1 | 1 |
| Fairview | 34 | 1-2 | 1 | 1 |
| Hartwell | 39 | 1-2, 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Hays | 108 | 1-6 | 3 | 3 |
| Heberle | 154 | 1-6* | 3 | 3 |
| Heinold | 105 | 1-5 | 3 | 3 |
| Hoffman | 103 | 1-5 | 3 | 3 |
| Hyde Park | 76 | 1-6 | 2 | 2 |
| Kirby Road | 72 | 1-3 | 2 | 2 |
| Linwood | 40 | 1-5 | 1 | 1 |
| McKinley | 65 | 1-3 | 2 | 2 |
| Midway | 24 | 1-2 | 1 | 1 |
| Millvale | 67 | 1-2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mt. Airy | 83 | 1-4 | 2 | 2 |
| North Avondale | 65 | 1-5 | 2 | 2 |
| North Fairmount | 72 | 1-4 | 2 | 2 |
| Oyler | 126 | 1-5 | 3 | 3 |
| Parham | 120 | 1-5 | 3 | 3 |
| Pleasant Hill | 73 | 1-4 | 2 | 2 |
| Pleasant Ridge | 80 | 1-4 | 2 | 2 |
| Quebec Heights | 146 | 1-6 | 4 | 4 |
| Rockdale | 116 | 1-4 | 3 | 3 |
| Roll Hill | 144 | 1-6 | 4 | 4 |
| Roosevelt | 74 | 1-5 | 2 | 2 |
| Rothenberg | 150 | 1-6* | 5 | 5 |
| Sands Montessori | 70 | 1-6 | 2 | 2 |
| Sayler Park | 81 | 1-5 | 2 | 2 |
| Silverton | 36 | 1-5 | 1 | 1 |
| South Avondale | 37 | 1-4 | .5 | .5 |
| Swifton | 73 | 1-4 | 2 | 2 |
| Taft Elementary | 116 | 1-5 | 3 | 3 |
| Vine | 38 | 1-2 | 1 | 1 |
| Washburn | 128 | 1-5 | 4 | 4 |
| Washington Park | 173 | 1-6 | 5 | 5 |
| Whittier | 183 | 1-4 | 5 | 5 |
| Windsor | 103 | 1-6 | 3 | 3 |
| Winton Place | 75 | 1-3 | 2 | 2 |
| Winton Terrace | 73 | 1-3 | 2 | 2 |
| Woodford | 37 | 1-3 | 1 | 1 |
| Corryville Catholic | 38 | 1-4 | 1 | 1 |
| Cure of Ars | 11 | 1-4 | .5 | .5 |
| Little Flower | 16 | 1-3, 5 | .5 | .5 |
| Nativity | 15 | 1-6 | .5 | .5 |
| Our Lady of Grace | 34 | 1-5, 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Our Lady of Lourdes | 16 | 1-5 | .5 | .5 |
| Resurrection | 18 | 1-5 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Agnes | 17 | 1-4 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Aloysius-Delhi | 26 | 1-4, 6 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Antoninus | 11 | 1-6, 8 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Boniface | 38 | 1-7 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Cecilia | 26 | 2-6 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Charles | 17 | 1-3, 5-8 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Clare | 11 | 1-3, 5, 7-8 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Francis DeSales | 42 | 1-5 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Francis Seraph | 55 | 1-8 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| St. Joseph | 46 | 1-5, 7-8 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| St. Lawrence | 23 | 1 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Margaret of Cortona | 29 | 1-7 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Mark | 32 | 1-8 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Martin | 20 | 1-3 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Mary | 19 | 1-5 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Pius | 36 | 1-6 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Theresa | 20 | 1-4 | .5 | .5 |
| St. Vincent DePaul | 9 | 1-3, 6-8 | .5 | .5 |
| St. William | 21 | 1-3 | .5 | .5 |

* Grades served includes mathematics program.

were retained during the 1984-85 school year. First, children in the lower grades were to be served before children in higher grades. Second, within each grade children were entered solely on the basis of their selection scores with lower scoring children entered first. One exception to these guidelines was made at grade two to give priority for selection to children who had been in project classes the previous year and who had failed to score above the cut-off set to determine project eligibility. This "continuous service" criteria was established to assure that minor variations in staffing would not prevent a child from remaining in the program. At the second grade level, all eligible first graders who had been in the project the previous year, were entered before new children were selected. At grades three and above, selection was based on the selection score alone.

In each school, Chapter I reading centers were staffed with project teachers and instructor assistants. Children in Chapter I classes received their basic reading instruction with the other children in their regular classroom. Each day the children received 45 to 50 minutes of additional reading instruction from the Chapter I teacher. Each teacher worked with about 37 students each day in five or six groups. During a given 50 minute period, a typical Chapter I teacher worked with five to eight students. The small group size and the low pupil-teacher ratio allowed the reading instruction to proceed on a highly individualized basis.

The Chapter I teacher worked closely with the classroom reading teacher to insure that the additional reading time was spent practicing or reinforcing the skills being taught in the regular classroom. Communication forms were developed to allow the classroom teachers to identify the skills and content which they felt the Chapter I teacher should reinforce. In many cases, the information on the communication forms was supplemented by formal or informal conferences with the classroom teachers.

The Chapter I reading rooms were equipped with a variety of appropriate and stimulating reading materials to capture the interest of the children. During the year, children were given several books through the Reading is Fun-damental program to develop interest in reading as a personally satisfying experience.

## Project Evaluation

The reading achievement objectives was changed in 1976-77 from a specification of student gains in terms of grade equivalents to specification of student gains in normal curve equivalents (NCE's). This new type of student gain measure is mandated in the current Federal evaluation procedures. The reading achievement objective states that students, "on the average, will gain seven NCE's between the administration of the pretest and the posttest."

The normal curve equivalent has a number of advantages over other measures of reading improvement. This process sets individual expectations for the improvement of each child in the program rather than expecting all children to make the same gains. Project gains were computed by converting the pretest percentile rank of each child to the corresponding NCE. The same procedure was used to convert posttest scores to NCE's. The pretest NCE was subtracted from the posttest NCE, and the changes were averaged within each grade for comparison with the criterion level stated in the project objective.

When using normal curve equivalents to measure reading gains, it is required that the test used for both the pretest and the posttest be "on level." In other words, it should be a level of the test that was normed by the publisher at the particular grade where it is used. In 1980-81, the system adopted the California Achievement Test Battery, 1978 edition, as part of the city-wide testing program. The new achievement test was used for the first time in 1981-82 to evaluate the Growth in Academic Performance Project. Table 2 gives the levels and forms of the test used in each grade for both selection of students and measurement of reading gains.

Table 2. Testing Dates, Test Levels and Forms Used for Selection, Pretest and Posttest in the 1984-85 Growth in Academic Performance Evaluation.

| Grade | Selection Test April 2-13, 1984 Level | Form | Pretest September 24-28, 1984 Level | Form | Posttest March 25-29, 1985 Level | Form |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Metropolitan Readiness Level II | P | 11 | C | 11 | C |
| 2 | 11 | C | 12 | C | 12 | C |
| 3 | 12 | C | 13 | C | 13 | C |
| 4 | 13 | C | 14 | C | 14 | C |
| 5 | 14 | D | 15 | C | 15 | C |
| 6 | 15 | D | 16 | C | 16 | C |
| 7 | 16 | D | 17 | C | 17 | C |
| 8 | 17 | D | 18 | C | 18 | C |

The city-wide achievement test administered between April 2 and April 13, 1984, was used as the selection test for entering students in grades two through six into the program during the 1984-85 school year. The test was administered at all grades in the 51 Chapter I public schools. In the non-public schools children with reading problems were identified and tested with the posttest group. Each of the Chapter I schools received a selection list for grades two through six which contained the total reading NCE scores of all students tested the previous April. The scores were listed in rank order from the lowest score to the highest. First grade students were tested for selection in either mid-April or mid-September with Level II, Form P of the Metropolitan Readiness Test.

## Results

### Reading Achievement

The reading achievement objective states that students will gain, on the

average 7 normal curve equivalents in the six months between the administration of the pretest and the administration of the posttest. Chapter I regulations specify three basic evaluation models which may be used to assess achievement gains. The norm-referenced design (Model A-1) was used in this evaluation. The gain attributed to the supplemental reading instruction was defined as the difference between the Chapter I group's performance on the reading posttest and an estimate of what performance on the posttest would have been, had the group not received additional help. This model can be expressed as follows:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chapter I Treatment Effect | = | Observed Post-Treatment Performance | - | Expected No-Treatment Performance |

The norm-referenced design generated a no-treatment expectation from the assumption that children in Chapter I schools, without the Chapter I project, would maintain their position in the national norm group from the pretest to the posttest.

The fall pretest and spring posttest scores were converted to normal curve equivalents for the computation of achievement gains. A gain in NCE's indicated that a child ranked higher against the norm group at the end of the year than at the beginning. No change, or zero NCE gain, meant that a child maintained his or her achievement in the norm group from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. It is important to remember that zero gain meant that growth in reading achievement was equal to that made by other children at the same initial achievement level. A loss in NCE's meant that a child ranked lower against the norm group at the end of the year than at the beginning.

A summary of achievement results for Chapter I students (both public and non-public school children) is presented in Table 3. The data indicate that the project objective of a gain of at least +7.0 NCE's was met at each grade level through grade six. Achievement gains at grades seven and eight fell

slightly short of the objective, but these were measured on a very small number of project students. The mean gain of +9.5 NCE's for all project students combined, exceeded the objective. This indicates that project students made achievement gains which were well above the expected growth during the six months of instruction.

Table 3. Summary of Chapter I Student Achievement by Grade 1984-85.

| Grade Level | Number of Students Tested* | Achievement in Normal Curve Equivalents | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean Pretest Status | Mean Posttest Status | Mean Gain |
| 1 | 1,646 | 33.0 | 42.7 | +9.7 |
| 2 | 504 | 26.7 | 39.8 | +13.1 |
| 3 | 587 | 27.6 | 36.0 | +8.4 |
| 4 | 612 | 26.8 | 35.8 | +9.0 |
| 5 | 384 | 27.8 | 36.0 | +8.2 |
| 6 | 134 | 29.7 | 36.9 | +7.2 |
| 7 | 28 | 37.4 | 42.5 | +5.1 |
| 8 | 9 | 36.9 | 43.4 | +6.5 |
| TOTALS | 3,904 | 29.9 | 39.4 | +9.5 |

* This is the number of students who completed both the pretest and posttest measures of achievement.

## Mathematics Achievement

Eligible students at two schools (Heberle and Rothenberg) received remedial instruction in mathematics during the 1984-85 school year. A total of 130 students in grades four through six participated in this component. The average gain in mathematics achievement for the 87 students completing both the pretest and posttest measures of achievement was 18.8 NCE's.

## Pupil Attitudes

The project included two objectives dealing with the feelings and attitudes

of Chapter I children. The first stated that project pupils "will have as positive attitudes toward themselves as comparable non-project pupils." The second stated that project pupils "will have as positive attitudes toward school as comparable non-project pupils."

Each school identified the regular classroom at each grade level which contained the highest proportion of project children. The intermediate grade attitude survey was not given due to the low number of children expected at these grades. The primary attitude survey was administered to one class at each grade in each of the target schools. The attitude survey was administered by trained testers and by the local school evaluators from the Evaluation Branch. The responses of project and non-project children to each item were compared using a two-way chi square test of significance. Data from the public and non-public schools in the project were combined for the analysis.

Survey Results. The Smiles Survey, an eighteen-item attitude scale, was administered to primary children. They responded by marking a smiling face or a sad face for each item. The survey contained three subgroups of items: attitudes toward self, attitudes toward school and attitudes toward learning.

The responses of the project and non-project children to the self-concept items are presented in Table 4. The non-project children had significantly more positive attitudes on three of the six self-concept items. The project children gave similar responses to the item dealing with growing up and getting older, with feelings about the kind of face they have, and with how they feel most of the time. The objective on self-concept was not met in the primary grades. An additional analysis of the self-concept items showed that both project and non-project children gave less positive self-concept responses than last year on four of the six items in this section.

The responses of the project and non-project children to items concerning schools are given in Table 5. Project children were significantly more

positive on one of the six items in this section. They felt better about the rules at their school. The non-project children were significantly more positive on three of the six items. The non-project children felt better about the way they were treated by their teacher, felt better about their school and were less less likely to want to change their schools. The results show that overall, the non-project children were more positive about school than the project children. The objective on attitudes toward school was not met in the primary grades, and an additional analysis indicated that both project and non-project students gave lower responses than last year on five of the six items in this section.

Table 4. Results of the Self-Concept Items, SMILES Survey, Primary Grades, 1984-85.

| Items | Chapter I Students (N = 1525) Smile | Frown | Non-Project Students (N = 1929) Smile | Frown | Chi Square | Signif. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How do you feel about growing up and getting older? | 87% | 13% | 87% | 13% | 0.1 | n.s.* |
| 2. How do you feel about how healthy and strong you are? | 94% | 6% | 98% | 2% | 33.3 | $p < .001$ |
| 3. How do you feel about the kind of face you have? | 83% | 17% | 84% | 16% | 0.8 | n.s.* |
| 4. How do you feel about the way other children treat you? | 31% | 69% | 44% | 56% | 66.2 | $p < .001$ |
| 5. How do you feel when you meet a new child? | 91% | 9% | 93% | 7% | 6.9 | $p < .01$ |
| 6. How do you feel most of the time? | 79% | 21% | 80% | 10% | 1.8 | n.s.* |

* n.s. = not significant

Table 5. Results of the Attitudes Toward School Items, SMILES Survey, Primary Grades, 1984-85.

| Items | Chapter I Students (N = 1525) Smile | Chapter I Students (N = 1525) Frown | Non-Project Students (N = 1929) Smile | Non-Project Students (N = 1929) Frown | Chi Square | Signif. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How do you feel when it's time to go to school? | 61% | 39% | 58% | 42% | 3.3 | n.s.* |
| 2. How do you feel about your school? | 79% | 21% | 83% | 17% | 7.9 | $p < .01$ |
| 3. How do you feel about the way your teacher treats you. | 72% | 28% | 77% | 23% | 11.8 | $p < .001$ |
| 4. How do you feel about the rules at your school? | 67% | 33% | 64% | 36% | 4.5 | $p < .05$ |
| 5. How do you feel about going to some other school? | 47% | 53% | 39% | 61% | 22.5 | $p < .001$ |
| 6. How do you feel about asking your teacher for help? | 85% | 15% | 85% | 15% | 0 | n.s.* |

* n.s. = not significant

The final set of items on the Smiles Survey was entitled "attitude toward learning." The response of project and non-project children to these items are presented in Table 6. Non-project children were significantly more positive on all four of the items in this category. An additional analysis indicated that project students gave responses lower than last year on all four items in this section while non-project students gave lower responses on two of these items.

Table 6. Results of the Attitudes Toward Learning Items, SMILES Survey, Primary Grades, 1984-85.

| Items | Chapter I Students (N = 1525) Smile | Chapter I Students (N = 1525) Frown | Non-Project Students (N = 1929) Smile | Non-Project Students (N = 1929) Frown | Chi Square | Signif. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How do you feel when you learn something new? | 95% | 5% | 98% | 2% | 21.1 | $p < .001$ |
| 2. How do you feel about what you know? | 94% | 6% | 98% | 2% | 37.9 | $p < .001$ |
| 3. How do you feel if you are asked to help another child? | 89% | 11% | 92% | 8% | 14.5 | $p < .001$ |
| 4. How do you feel when you finish a hard job? | 68% | 32% | 79% | 21% | 51.6 | $p < .001$ |

Primary grade children in Chapter I were less positive on items concerning attitudes toward self, attitudes toward school, and attitudes toward learning than the non-project children.

Attendance

Attendance by project children has been used as a second indicator of attitudes toward school. Table 7 compares the attendance of all children in the project schools with the attendance of Chapter I project children in those schools. Overall, the project children in public schools attended school 93 percent of the time. The attendance of all children in the project schools averaged 92 percent. The attendance of Chapter I children was slightly higher in the non-public schools. No school-wide attendance comparisons were available in the non-public schools.

Home-School Contacts

In each school, Chapter I teachers and instructor assistants worked with the principal to improve parent participation in the project. In addition, the project supervisor of home-school relations provided coordination and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Table 7. Yearly Average Percentage of Attendance for Project Schools, by Group, 1984-85.

| Schools | Project Pupils % Attendance | Total School % Attendance |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson Place | 94% | 91% |
| Bond Hill | 95 | 93 |
| Bramble | 95 | 92 |
| Burton | 98 | 90 |
| Carson | 94 | 93 |
| Carthage | 92 | 89 |
| Central Fairmount | 96 | 90 |
| Chase Intermediate | 91 | 90 |
| Cheviot | 90 | 93 |
| Clifton | 94 | 94 |
| College Hill | 94 | 92 |
| Douglass | 93 | 92 |
| Eastern Hills | 93 | 93 |
| Fairview | 87 | 92 |
| Hartwell | 89 | 91 |
| Hays | 93 | 93 |
| Heberle | 93* | 90 |
| Heinold | 89 | 86 |
| Hoffman | 96 | 91 |
| Hyde Park | 92 | 93 |
| Kirby Road | 92 | 89 |
| Linwood | 96 | 90 |
| McKinley | 92 | 92 |
| Midway | 93 | 93 |
| Millvale | 94 | 91 |
| Mt. Airy | 95 | 92 |
| North Avondale | 81 | 94 |
| North Fairmount | 89 | 88 |
| Oyler | 94 | 92 |
| Parham | 95 | 94 |
| Pleasant Hill | 93 | 91 |
| Pleasant Ridge | 92 | 93 |
| Quebec Heights | 92 | 91 |
| Rockdale | 93 | 91 |
| Roll Hill | 96 | 92 |
| Roosevelt | 93 | 91 |
| Rothenberg (Reading) | 91 | 88 |
| (Math) | 84 | |
| Sands Montessori | 91 | 96 |
| Sayler Park | 93 | 93 |
| Silverton | 95 | 95 |
| South Avondale | 94 | 92 |
| Swifton | 98 | 95 |
| Taft Elementary | 93 | 90 |
| Vine | 91 | 93 |
| Washburn | 94 | 92 |
| Washington Park | 93 | 90 |
| Whittier | 93 | 89 |
| Windsor | 96 | 89 |
| Winton Place | 92 | 90 |
| Winton Terrace | 94 | 89 |
| Woodford | 96 | 95 |
| Total Public Schools | 93% | 92% |
| Corryville Catholic | 97% | ** |
| Cure of Ars | 96 | |
| Little Flower | 97 | |
| Nativity | 94 | |
| Our Lady of Grace | 94 | |
| Our Lady of Lourdes | 98 | |
| Resurrection | 97 | |
| St. Agnes | 97 | |
| St. Aloysius-Delhi | 85 | |
| St. Antoninus | 96 | |
| St. Boniface | 95 | |
| St. Cecilia | 96 | |
| St. Charles | 97 | |
| St. Clare | 99 | |
| St. Francis DeSales | 96 | |
| St. Francis Seraph | 95 | |
| St. Joseph | 95 | |
| St. Lawrence | 95 | |
| St. Margaret of Cortona | 98 | |
| St. Mark | 96 | |
| St. Martin | 98 | |
| St. Mary | 95 | |
| St. Pius | 90 | |
| St. Theresa | 98 | |
| St. Vincent DePaul | 95 | |
| St. William | 98 | |
| Total Parochial Schools | 96% | |

*Heberle data includes both reading and math.
**No school-wide comparison data were collected in the non-public schools.

assistance to the local school staff in increasing parent involvement. Data on home-school contacts are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Number of Project Parents Involved and Type of Involvement, 1983-84 and 1984-85.

| Total Number of: | 1983-84 | 1984-85 |
|---|---|---|
| Home Visits of Professional and Paraprofessionals | 816 | 832 |
| Telephone Contacts by Professionals and Paraprofessionals | 14,193 | 17,568 |
| Written Contacts by Project Staff | 78,895 | 85,354 |
| Individual Parent-Teacher Conferences | 5,508 | 6,030 |
| Parents Participating in Classrooms | 315 | 506 |
| Classroom Observations/Visitations | 2,106 | 2,045 |
| School Advisory Council Meetings | 447 | 163 |
| School Advisory Council Attendance | 5,703 | 6,043 |

Increases were recorded in all of the parent involvement categories except for classroom observations/visitations and the number of school advisory council meetings. The increases in most categories were expected since the teaching staff increased by eight percent over 1984. When corrected for the addition of staff, the number of telephone and written contacts with parents, the number of parent-teacher conferences, and the number of parents participating in classrooms showed increases over last year.

Inservice Training

The fifth objective states that "inservice will be provided for all project personnel the first week of school, and continuously throughout the school year." The data were collected and organized in the project coordinator's monthly report.

Several hundred inservice events were carried out at individual Chapter I

schools. These events were conducted by the local staff, by Chapter I supervisors and by a variety of outside resource persons.

Two items concerning the inservice program were included on the teacher survey administered in March to all Chapter I teachers. Ninety-one percent of the teachers rated the quality of the city-wide inservice programs as average or above average. Seventy-nine percent of the teachers rated the quality of the local school inservice programs as average or better.

Teacher Survey Results. Each Chapter I teacher was sent a survey in late March. A total of 138 surveys were returned by staff members in the Growth in Academic Performance Project, and a summary of results is shown in Table 9. The teachers gave positive ratings to all of the survey items except for the items dealing with parent involvement. The highest ratings were given to the effectiveness of the program on reading achievement and self-image, and coordination of Chapter I activities with the regular classroom. Overall, the ratings were higher than in the previous year. This was a change from the previous year in which ratings had declined on most items.

Table 9. Number and Percent Responding to ECIA Chapter I Teacher Survey, 1984-85 (N = 138).*

| Items | Poor | | | Average | | | Excellent | | Mean Average 1983-84 | Mean Average 1984-85 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | |
| 1. Effectiveness of the Chapter I program on reading achievement. | 3<br>2% | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 5<br>4% | 10<br>7% | 41<br>30% | 79<br>57% | 6.3 | 6.4 |
| 2. Understanding of the Chapter I program by classroom teachers. | 3<br>2% | 1<br>1% | 0<br>0% | 4<br>3% | 15<br>11% | 24<br>17% | 45<br>33% | 46<br>33% | 5.5 | 5.8 |
| 3. Communication with feeder teachers. | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 1<br>1% | 3<br>2% | 16<br>11% | 27<br>20% | 40<br>29% | 51<br>37% | 5.7 | 5.8 |
| 4. Quality of the City-wide Chapter I in-service activities. | 1<br>1% | 0<br>0% | 2<br>1% | 9<br>7% | 23<br>17% | 19<br>14% | 49<br>35% | 35<br>25% | 5.4 | 5.5 |
| 5. Quality of the local school Chapter I in-service meetings. | 18<br>13% | 1<br>1% | 0<br>0% | 10<br>7% | 22<br>16% | 25<br>18% | 39<br>28% | 23<br>17% | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| 6. Coordination of Chapter I activities with regular classroom. | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 3<br>2% | 10<br>7% | 20<br>14% | 49<br>36% | 56<br>41% | 5.7 | 6.1 |
| 7. Effectiveness of Chapter I program on student self-image. | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 0<br>0% | 5<br>4% | 26<br>19% | 57<br>41% | 50<br>36% | 5.9 | 6.1 |
| 8. The involvement of parents in the Chapter I program. | 1<br>1% | 7<br>5% | 21<br>15% | 28<br>20% | 41<br>30% | 21<br>15% | 12<br>9% | 7<br>5% | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| 9. Effectiveness of local school evaluation. | 11<br>8% | 3<br>2% | 2<br>1% | 4<br>3% | 35<br>25% | 37<br>27% | 34<br>25% | 12<br>9% | 4.5 | 5.0 |
| 10. Adequacy of instructional materials in Chapter I classroom. | 1<br>1% | 1<br>1% | 4<br>3% | 11<br>8% | 15<br>11% | 18<br>13% | 47<br>34% | 40<br>29% | 5.4 | 5.5 |
| 11. Effectiveness of the Scott-Foresman or Open Court Management Systems.. | 34<br>25% | 1<br>1% | 1<br>1% | 4<br>3% | 18<br>13% | 20<br>14% | 29<br>21% | 31<br>22% | --- | 5.6 |
| 12. Understanding of the Chapter I program by project parents. | 3<br>2% | 0<br>0% | 4<br>3% | 9<br>6% | 38<br>28% | 40<br>29% | 30<br>22% | 14<br>10% | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| 13. Effectiveness of the Core Vocabulary program (participants only). | 52<br>38% | 2<br>1% | 2<br>1% | 8<br>6% | 27<br>20% | 17<br>12% | 19<br>14% | 11<br>8% | 4.8 | 4.8 |

* Some responses by instructor assistants are included in these data.
** Number and percent of no responses.

Cost Breakdown. The total cost of the Growth in Academic Performance component of the Cincinnati Chapter I program is supported from the Federal ECIA Chapter I allocation. Table 10 summarizes the cost breakdown of the Growth in Academic Performance Budget for the 1984-85 fiscal year. The figures in the table represent the budgeted amounts as presented in the 1984 application which was approved by the Department of Federal Assistance. The total budget of $6,182,998 was an increase of $232,226 over the previous school year.

Table 10. Cost Breakdown for the Growth in Academic Performance Component, 1984-85.

| Component | Budgeted Amount |
|---|---|
| **Instruction and Supportive Services** | |
| Teacher Salaries | $ 3,531,537 |
| Aides | 896,633 |
| Retirement and Fringe Benefits | 1,191,702 |
| Inservice | 7,305 |
| Meeting Expenses and Equipment Repair | 13,261 |
| Equipment | 1,073 |
| Instructional Supplies | 154,897 |
| | $ 5,796,408 |
| **Administrative Services** | |
| Salaries | $ 76,500 |
| Retirement and Fringe Benefits | 22,090 |
| Supplies | 8,000 |
| | $ 106,590 |
| **Indirect Costs** | |
| Personnel, Purchasing, Payroll | $ 280,000 |
| | $ 280,000 |
| T O T A L | $ 6,182,998 |

## Summary and Recommendations

The Chapter I Growth in Academic Performance project was successful during the 1984-85 school year in improving reading achievement of participating students. Overall, project students made an average achievement gain of +9.5 NCE's, and the objective calling for a gain of at least +7.0 NCE's was met at each grade level in grades one through six.

Attitudes of Chapter I students toward self, school, and learning were not as high as non-project children at similar grade levels. Discrepancies between responses by these two groups were not great in magnitude, but the objective calling for equivalent attitudes was not achieved.

An increased number of contacts between teachers and parents was achieved, and parent involvement in the program was higher on most measures of parent activities. The objective calling for parent involvement was achieved.

The objective which specified continuing inservice training for project staff members was achieved. Ninety-one percent of the teachers indicated on a survey that the quality of these training sessions was average or better. Overall, project staff members gave higher ratings compared to the previous year on most survey items dealing with project activities.

Based upon these findings, the following recommendations are presented for consideration by project administrators:

a. Additional attention should be given to improving the attitudes and self-concept of students in this project.

b. Additional efforts should be made to involve project parents in project-related activities and in the education of their children.

Approved:
Joseph F. Gastright
Director
Evaluation Branch